UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,478	09/29/2006	Marcel Beij	NL 040340	9572

24737 7590 09/26/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
CHEN, JIANZI	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2821	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/599,478	BEIJ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jianzi Chen	2821	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05/30/2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 September 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *05/30/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 6, line 3, "3" should be changed to - -2- -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang, WO Publication No. 2004/023849 A1 in view of Morgan et al., US Publication No. 2002/0145394 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Wang discloses in fig.1A a device (1) for controlling the lighting (lighting control system, abstract) in a room, the device comprising:

-a controller unit (100, fig.1A), the controller unit comprising

-processing means (MCU, fig.2) and

- one or more light measuring cells (sensors 35,37, fig.1A) communicatively connected to the processing means (MCU);

- one or more luminaires (10,20,30, fig.1A), wherein the one or more luminaires (10,20,30) and the controller unit (100) are communicatively connected in an addressable digital lighting system (DALI, fig.1A) as shown above; but does not specifically disclose assign address to each luminaire as claimed. However Morgan

teaches of an apparatus for a lighting system comprising a processor (102) **wherein the processing means (102) is programmed to automatically assign a digital address to each luminaire (LEDs) and further to automatically identify a spatial position (lighting condition) of each luminaire and thereby automatically provide a relationship between the digital address and the spatial position of each luminaire (detail description of figs. 1 and 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Morgan's invention with Wang's invention because Morgan provides the motivation that it would be much easier and faster to attach a lighting device to a programming device with loading address into the lighting device (page 2, section 28).**

Regarding claims 2 and 3, the device according to claim 1, Morgan further teaches wherein the spatial position of each luminaire (5) is identified from perceived light levels or changes in perceived light levels (page 3, section 37); Morgan further teaches wherein the processing means is adapted to, once the spatial position of each luminaire has been determined, to install pre-programmed lighting scenes suitable for the determined configuration of luminaries (detail description of figs. 1 and 3);). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Morgan's invention with Wang's invention because Morgan provides the motivation that it would be much easier and faster to attach a

lighting device to a programming device with loading address into the lighting device (page 2, section 28).

Regarding claim 4, the device according to claim 1, Wang further discloses wherein the luminaries contain gas discharge lamps (it is well know in the art of circuitry the lighting unit could be a gas discharge lamps) and wherein the processing means (MCU) is communicatively connected to a ballast (5, 15, 25, fig.1A) of each of the gas discharge lamps.

Regarding claim 5, the device according to claim 1, Wang further discloses the device further including a user control (30) (user interface, page 9, lines 1-9) for controlling the luminaries individually or in groups.

Regarding claim 6, Wang discloses in fig.1A a controller unit (2) () for controlling the lighting in a room, the controller unit (100) comprising:

- processing means (MCU, fig.2) ;
- one or more light measuring cells (3) **(10,20,30, fig.1A)** communicatively connected to the processing means (MCU, fig.2); and
- means for communicative connecting the controller unit (100) to one or more luminaries (5) **(10,20,30)**, the luminaries being communicatively connected in an addressable digital lighting system (DALI, fig.1A) as shown above; but does not specifically disclose assign address to each luminaire as claimed. However Morgan

teaches of an apparatus for a lighting system comprising a processor (102) wherein the processing means (102) is programmed to automatically assign a digital address to each luminaire (LEDs) and further to automatically identify a spatial position (lighting condition) of each luminaire and thereby automatically provide a relationship between the digital address and the spatial position of each luminaire (detail description of figs. 1 and 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Morgan's invention with Wang's invention because Morgan provides the motivation that it would be much easier and faster to attach a lighting device to a programming device with loading address into the lighting device (page 2, section 28).

Regarding claim 7, Wang further discloses a connector device (RF transmitter and RF receiver) communicatively connected to two or more of the devices according to claim 1, wherein the connector device (RF transmitter and RF receiver) is adapted to control each of the two or more devices, and thereby adapted to control each of the luminaires connected to each of the two or more devices (abstract).

Regarding claim 8, the connector device according to claim 7, Morgan further teaches wherein the control device comprises processing means and wherein the processing means is adapted to install pre-programmed lighting scenes suitable for the control of the two or more devices (detail description of figs. 1 and 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine Morgan's invention with Wang's invention because Morgan provides the motivation that it would be much easier and faster to attach a lighting device to a programming device with loading address into the lighting device (page 2, section 28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan et al., US Publication No. 2002/0145394 A1.

As to claim 9, Morgan discloses in fig.2 and related description a method for identification of an individually addressable luminaire () in a room, the method comprising the following steps:

a) assigning randomly digital addresses to each of the addressable luminaires (lighting system);

b) turning off all the luminaires;

c) turning on, a first luminaire corresponding to the first digital address and measuring by using a light detector the light intensity of the incident light and/or the direction from where the incident light originates, then turning off the first luminaire;

d) turning on a next luminaire corresponding to the next digital address and measuring

the light intensity of the incident light and/or the direction from where the incident light originates, then turning off the next luminaire;

e) repeating step d) until all light intensities and/or directions have been measured, determining the spatial positions of each of the luminaires from the measured light intensities and/or direction, and thereby providing a matrix representing the digital addresses and corresponding spatial positions of all the luminaires.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jianzi Chen whose telephone number is 5712705292. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 10:00- 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas W. Owens can be reached on 5712721662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jianzi Chen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2821

/Douglas W Owens/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2821
September 23, 2008